



The City of Seattle

## Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

LPB 136/08

### MINUTES

#### Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting

Seattle Municipal Tower

700 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 40th Floor

Room 4060

Wednesday, February 20, 2008– 3:30 p.m.

#### Board Members Present

Vernon Abelsen  
Mollie Tremaine  
Marie Strong  
Mark Hannum  
Tom Veith  
Christine Howard  
Stephen Lee  
Czarina Nicolas  
Ron Martinson

#### Staff

Elizabeth Chave  
Sarah Sodt  
Melinda Bloom  
Rebecca Frestedt

#### Board Members Absent

Alyce Conti  
Henry Matthews

Stephen Lee, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.

**02208.1**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Meetings of December 19, 2007 and January 16, 2008 deferred.

**MM/SC/TV/MS**

**9:0:0 Motion carried.**

**022008.2**

#### **CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL**

022008.21

4851 Rainier Avenue South  
(Columbia City Landmark District)  
Proposed exterior alterations

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt read from the Staff Report and said that the applicant proposes to restore the façade of a contributing building within the Columbia City Landmark District to its pre-1958 appearance. She said that the building was constructed in 1912 and is a visually prominent mixed-use building. The current

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

building appearance stems from 1958 renovations, including the addition of asbestos cladding. A window survey revealed that the window sills had been cut back to the wall plane during the renovations. She said that the Columbia City Review Committee (CCRC) and Landmarks Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Approval for the existing Fashion Nails sign on S. Edmunds St. in May 2007.

Ms. Frestedt said that Columbia City Landmark District Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed exterior alterations on January 18, 2008. She introduced project applicant, Art Pederson, from Cedar Tree Architects.

Applicant Comment: Mr. Pederson said the building was renovated in 1958 and what is visible today is what was done in 1958. He proposed stripping off the asbestos cladding to bring the exterior close to its original appearance. He said they do not plan to rebuild the cornice but will be adding trim details and the siding will recall the detailing from the original construction. He said the storefront on Rainer Avenue South will remain unchanged but there will be some in-kind tile replacement. He described the deterioration of the second floor windows and said they are too expensive to repair and will be replaced with a good matching double hung wood windows. He said the cladding on the Edmonds Street addition will match 4" exposure and trim details, recalling the existing building details. The broken tiles will be replaced at the sidewalk level. He said that they will strip off existing siding along the alley and replace it. He said they will strip off existing original on the south façade as it is in bad shape and replace it with the same material used on the other three sides. He added that it is visible from only the alley.

Board Questions:

Mr. Hannum asked if there was original material under the asbestos siding on the south side.

Mr. Pederson said it had been stripped off.

Mr. Abelsen said the CCRC indicated building materials should be selected in keeping with the historic character and asked how Hardi-plank fits this.

Mr. Pederson said conserving the environment is important and the original siding was cedar fir. He said you can get a good match using alternative materials without clear cutting any trees.

Mr. Hannum asked why they are replacing the original south side siding.

Mr. Pederson said water penetration has caused damage.

Ms. Frestedt said the CCRC discussed the removal of original materials on the south side. She said the CCRC was comfortable with the request given the limited visibility. The Committee also noted the replacement would provide continuity throughout the building.

Ms. Tremaine asked why they were not putting the cornice back on and if there were plans to add it later.

Mr. Pederson said it was very expensive to do so and that there were no plans to add a cornice later. Instead, they are proposing a wide band of trim above the window, which the CCRC recommended to represent the cornice, as a compromise.

Mr. Pederson said the owners had previously submitted a proposal using a different contractor. The initial proposal was smaller in scope. He said that the current restoration proposal is a bigger step in the right direction toward restoration of the building's character. The cornice was never discussed with the property owner.

Mr. Veith asked about the parapet.

Mr. Pederson said it will remain the same.

Mr. Veith asked about the area above the band cap.

Mr. Pederson said it would also be a wide section of 10" deep section of Hardi Plank. There will be three courses of 4" to the weather and if you look closely at the historic photographs it is sympathetic to the original.

Mr. Abelsen asked about comparison of the proposed new windows to the existing.

Mr. Veith said there were other options - Millwork Supply rather than Lindal or Marvin.

Mr. Pederson said that he selected the product based on his experience and the product's appearance.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Abelsen commented on the lost of historic materials. He said the CCRC considered and approved the proposal so he thinks it is acceptable as long as the Board is cognizant of that. He would support it.

Mr. Hannum shared his concern, especially related to the windows.

Ms. Tremain said she would like to see the cornice replaced.

Mr. Lee said they can't require it and said that the proposed alterations are an improvement.

**Action:** I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed exterior alterations of the property located at 4851 Rainier Avenue South. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following sections of the Columbia City Landmark District Guidelines:

**Relevant Code citations**

**SMC 25.20.070 – Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property**

**Relevant guidelines**

**2. Building Materials and Fixtures.** Integrity of structure, form and decoration should be respected. Building facades should be brick, wood, or other materials that are in keeping with the historic character of the District.

**3. Building Surface Treatments.** Approved surface treatments shall be consistent with the historic qualities of the District. No paint shall be applied to unpainted masonry surfaces.

Painted surfaces shall be:

b. Repainted with subdued colors that are appropriate and consistent with the building and other buildings in the District. Local paint stores have an "historic colors" palette that may be useful as a guide. The Board Coordinator also has a palette of historic colors that may be used as reference.

**Secretary of the Interior Standards:**

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

**MM/SC/MH/CH**

**9:0:0 Motion carried.**

022008.22

4729 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue South

(Columbia City Landmark District)

Proposed demolition of a non-contributing building and preliminary design of new construction of two duplexes.

Staff Report: Ms. Frestedt presented relevant background information and said the house is a *non-contributing* home within the Columbia City Landmark District. It is located on the Columbia City Green, directly behind the Columbia Branch Library. It was built between 1905-1908. She said that the non-contributing status is the result of significant alterations, including: addition of a basement, enclosure of the front porch, and removal of the original cladding, windows and sashes.

Ms. Frestedt said the home is the only extant historic non-contributing home that remains along the park. She submitted a copy of the property inventory sheet and historic report. She said the lot is zoned L-2 residential. She said the small vernacular home located immediately to the South is a contributing property within the historic district and has been the point of much discussion by the CCRC in terms of the massing and scale of the proposed new construction and the relationship to the scale of the existing homes in the District.

Ms. Frestedt said the issue of demolition has been supported by CCRC with one exception. She said Mr. Hannum expressed concern about demolition early on due to the massing and proposed new construction and not wanting to overwhelm the site or change the character of the green. Ms. Frestedt said the apartments on the north end were built in 1992 and that the project will not trigger SEPA. She introduced the applicant, Samantha Beadel and Heather Johnston, from Place Architects.

Applicant Comments: Ms. Beadel said they propose to build two duplexes on the site, with two units in front and two in back. She said they revised the original design in response to recommendations of CCRC to meet their requirements of being more in scale with the existing Green. She said the front duplex has the character of a single family home even though it is a duplex; with a hidden second entrance. She said the front building will have two stories and the back will have three stories. She said that the back building is not very visible due to the slope of the green. She said one barely has a sense of the buildings in the back when standing in front.

Ms. Beadel said there is a contributing property to the south. She said the property line for this lot is adjacent to the contributing property but they are looking at it as being adjusted to the retaining wall to south so there is more space between proposed development and the property to the south. She said they are trying to add modulation to façade, so there more interest to that property as passing by.

Board Questions:

Mr. Lee said that most of the Board has seen this during the ARC meeting.

Mr. Abelsen asked about the significance of the naming of Rosby-Garrison House.

Ms. Beadel said according to original survey they were both previous occupants.

Mr. Veith asked if they had made any changes since ARC meeting.

Ms. Beadel said no.

Ms. Frestedt said the applicant has been responsive to the New Construction Guidelines that were adopted in 2006, specifically related to the sections addressing the roofline and massing. She said their attention to detail has helped with the integration of the proposed new construction into neighborhood.

Ms. Johnson added that the existing house is located above the green, and the new construction will be excavated down a bit so there is more volume, but the rooflines are similar and very integrated with flow of entire area.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Howard said the massing is nice.

Mr. Hannum said he was concerned about materials going forward.

Ms. Beadel said they would be happy to go through all that at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Veith said it was a good example of a house that picks up the character of the surrounding buildings without trying to be an old building.

Mr. Lee said it is a great example of what can be done.

**Action:** I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for the proposed Demolition at 4729 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. This action is based on the following Code citations:

**Relevant Code citations:**

**Columbia City Guidelines/Specific**

1. Scale of Buildings and Structures. The scale of all structures in relationship to other structures and spaces is important. The scale should continue to be small and relatively uniform.

13. New Construction

SMC 25.12.835 – Demolition

SMC 25.20.080 – Application for certificate of approval

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9

**MM/SC/TV/CH**

**9:0:0 Motion carried.**

**Action:** I move that the Landmarks Preservation Board approve a Certificate of Approval for Preliminary Design, at 4729 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue S., as proposed. This action is based on the following:

The proposed alterations meet the following Code citations:

**Relevant Code citations:**

**Columbia City Landmark District Ordinance**

25.20.020 Legislative findings and purposes

25.20.040 C. Criteria for designation of the District – Architectural

25.20.070 Approval of changes to buildings, structures and other property

25.20.080 Application for certificate of approval

25.20.090 B. Board meeting on Certificate of Approval

**Columbia City Design Guidelines/Specific**

1. Scale of Buildings and Structures. The scale of all structures in relationship to other structures and spaces is important. The scale should continue to be small and relatively uniform.

13. New Construction

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9

**MM/SC/TV/CH**

**9:0:0 Motion carried.**

022008.23

Pier 56

1201 Alaskan Way

Proposed awning cover replacement

Staff Report: Ms. Sodt said that the proposed changes are to replace existing fabric awning cover with metal awning roofing--the existing freestanding awning frame will remain and that the sign graphics will be applied to the new awning material.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if the graphics along the edge would be replaced and asked if the original fabric is some sort of translucent fabric.

Ms. Sodt said yes and that the applicant does not plan to do another translucent fabric.

Mr. Lee asked if the proposed color existed anywhere else on the building.

Ms. Sodt said there is another awning on the building and their intent is the new awning color will match that.

Mr. Abelsen said there is a dibond sign insert in a track and that isn't clearly stated. He asked for clarification.

Ms. Sodt said that it did indeed need clarification and that it is unfortunate that the applicant is not present.

Mr. Lee recommended the applicant come back to ARC to follow-up on the signage.

Mr. Veith asked if there was lighting inside the existing.

Ms. Sodt said yes and that it will remain.

Mr. Veith asked if the existing sign was lighted.

Ms. Sodt said that the signage was not currently lit.

Mr. Lee suggested that the board vote on the metal replacement and then have ARC deal with details of signage.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed replacement of the existing fabric awning with metal awning roofing at Pier 56, 1201 Alaskan Way with the applicant to return to ARC to discuss actual details and application of signage.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed alterations do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in the Designation Report because the proposed alterations do not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, and are compatible with the massing,

size, scale and architectural features of the property, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

2. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/VA/MT

9:0:0 Motion carried.

022008.3

### DESIGNATION

022008.34

Manning's/Denny's Building  
5501 15th Ave NW

#### Applicant Presentation:

Jack McCullough introduced himself and said he was there on behalf of Benaroya Company and Rhapsody Partners, the owner of property. He introduced speakers Al Symington, family member of DiFioritos who originally owned and developed the property; Arthur Chang, member of their Architectural team; Larry Johnson, Architectural Historian; Tim Rood, Faculty of UC Berkeley and Judith Sobol, Architectural Historian.

Al Symington said his in-law's parents Dominic and Marianne DiFiorito purchased the property in 1939 from the Seattle Gas Company. The building had operated as a collection point for people to pay gas bills. The Seattle Gas Company declared the property was surplus and under lease to the Siberian Ice Creamery and sold it to the DiFioritos; Mrs. DiFiorito did not operate the business. He said in 1948 the property was redeveloped into a Shell Oil Station and in the early 1960s Mannings put a restaurant on the site. The original building had a capacity for about 155 people and a 40 space parking lot. Manning's changed the building in the early 1970s and put in drop ceilings, ferns, lights. The center part of the building had a raised area put in. Mr. Symington said by the late 1970s Manning's wasn't the company it had been and the DiFioritos were not happy with the tenant and wanted to get them out. Mr. Symington said he inspected building at that time and the vertical glu lam columns had rot in them which has since been remedied by encasing in steel. When Manning's went out of business the glu lam showed rot on the end and were trimmed off. Denny's came into the site in the early 1980s and operated until the Monorail project took the property in 2004. He said the building was altered during Denny's remodel. Denny's originally planned to tear down and replace with a building similar to the one in Lacey. Denny's had difficulty getting plans approved due to the issue of slowness of permitting process. He said that Paul DiFiorito was disgusted and told Denny's if they made modifications they would have greater seating capacity than with new, so Denny's stayed.

Mr. Chang provided a slide presentation and gave an overview of alterations. He said Mr. Symington provided an original set of the 1984 plans from when Denny's moved into the building which show all the construction that was done at that time. He showed the demolition plan and said everything highlighted in pink on plan identified items that have been removed, stating much was demolished. He said interior walls, finishes, lighting all have been removed and replaced with many new walls. He pointed out that everything highlighted in green on the plan identifies the newer construction. He said the original Manning's dining room extended further



before new addition added a bar and kitchen which encroached upon and shrunk dining room. A new vestibule and seating area further shrunk the dining floor area. He said a new ceiling was added to conceal new HVAC equipment installed above. He said the drawings also show new penetrations through the roof to support new HVAC and kitchen equipment. Structural design drawings show revisions done to space to support new ceiling showing glue laminated “glulam” beams being altered. He said a new firewall was put up in the plenum space to make it safer; new framing was “stepped out” from one of the original glulam beams. He said the drawings showed the three dominant elevations after the building was remodeled and highlighted in pink are the areas of glass that were removed and replaced with T-111 plywood. He said only 28% of the original glass remains. The added vestibule included new entry doors which are a Denny’s prototype and there were also new cut-ins for other doors. He said the green portions on the drawing identify structural members that were replaced. He said the original architecture detailed downspouts discharge at the base of the glulam columns which then rotted out and have been replaced by steel columns. He said the glulam beams have dry rot in them and have been reinforced with steel channels. The original bents have upswept shape adding that their exposed ends suffered from dry rot and were cut off. He said the blue color on the plans indicates where there was lots of new mechanical added to roof. He said the original “mechanical spine” that concealed original HVAC has been altered. He said the upper transoms at the storefront framed in the main dining area and the beam ends show where beam ends were chopped off. He said the steel beams show how it has been flitched in to wood beams; the putty used to conceal the wood rot is visible. He said a new entry was cut in through the south wall with the original planter altered to accommodate it. He said the gabled end shows that the glu lam beam is not supporting anything; it has been backed up by a steel channel in order to support the loads.

Mr. Chang said the drawing of the roof plan shows highlighted in pink is all the new mechanical curbs and penetrations that were made. He said it shows and calls out for demolition of the mechanical spine that was part of the original construction to conceal original HVAC system. He said the original drawings show this spine running the entire length of the building; he said it was clever because it meant that the profile of the building stood out without a lot of clutter on the roof. He said this has since changed; the roof now has additional mechanical added that come up to almost the tallest portion of the building.

Larry Johnson said the building has lost a lot of its material integrity though it does retain its original shape and six of its original glulam bents. He said major changes to the exterior include major loss of exterior glazed area; alterations of public entries; loss and severe deterioration of exterior structural material and loss of original signage. He said when the building was originally constructed the glazing extended all the way up to the gable ends; it has been replaced by T-111 siding. He said the interior changes include major changes to the plan including serving area, entry and bar addition, dropped ceiling, the loss of original finish materials and original lighting. He said it has lost much physical and material integrity and no longer conveys the feeling of a 1960s restaurant.

Mr. Johnson said design significance versus historical significance had to be balanced; if there is enough physical integrity to convey its significance at all or is historic significance so important that some of the physical integrity can be

overlooked. He cited the Colman School which was built in 1909 and has been designated a landmark; it has become the new African American Museum.

Mr. Johnson said that Criteria A, B, and C were non relevant. He said that regarding Criteria D, Ms. Sobol would talk more about Googie style later. He said there has been discussion if this building had Scandinavian roots, or if it was based on the Design Pavilion, or did it have some Polynesian Influences. He said the building was a mixture of historic forms which he referred to as “Scandagooginesian”. He asked how to compare this to others of its type-Spuds in Green Lake to Canlis Restaurant. He said the glu lam fir beams were shaped in Bellingham. He said the glu-lam technology was new and came from Europe in the 1930 but by the 1960’s was pretty common construction method; without preservatives it will rot. He said he thinks this building does not meet B.

Mr. Johnson said regarding Criterion E, Timothy Rood would discuss architect Clarence Mayhew who was known for working in the Bay Area Style. He said Manning’s is not a superior representation of his work. He said regarding Criterion F that while the shape of the roof is distinctive the Denney’s sign is most prominent. He said the building is most visible right at the intersection; it is at a key intersection location so any building there would be prominent just because of that corner. He said it does not fit under Criterion F.

Timothy Rood, AICP, UC Berkeley said that architect Clarence Mayhew did most of his work in Piedmont, California. He said Mayhew went to Architecture school at U.C. Berkeley and it was there he did his best known work. Mr. Rood said he has worked on two rehabilitation projects on two national register buildings one of which was the former Architecture Building where Mayhew went to school at U.C. Berkeley. Mr. Rood said he feels that he knows Mr. Mayhew’s work and he wants to put this building in context with Mayhew’s other work. He said Mayhew was a very successful architect and was best known for his residential work and his campus and hospital buildings received some notice. He said there were about 20 articles in trade publications in the 1940s and 1950s, the last know citation was in 1961 although Mayhew lived until 1994. He said there was one record of an award given to a Mayhew building and that was for a house he did in Piedmont in 1960 which won honorable mention in the large house category for an AIA award. Mr. Rood said he didn’t find any other indications of buildings that had won awards or any indication that any of his designs had ever been nominated or selected as a landmark, historical or cultural resource or a contributing structure in an historic district. He said he found little if any evidence of scholarly or academic interest in Mayhew’s work and until this controversy came up there was nothing in the record to associate this building with Googie. He said Mayhew was a Beaux Arts trained architect adept in a variety of historical styles. He was very well connected; he was a member of the Bohemian Club and took part in the annual Bohemian Baroque ceremony and rubbed shoulders with David Rockefeller, David Packard, and Edgar F. Kaiser.

Mr. Rood showed photos of custom homes that Mayhew designed in the 1930s during the Depression. He said his houses had an Asian style or quality of some of the interiors. He showed photos of other homes in the Piedmont area that showed a pastiche of Monterey, Colonial, and Neo-Classical; he was fond of bay windows with copper roofs.

Mr. Rood said he believed that Sally Woodbridge may have sent a letter to the Board and he said that she mentioned Mayhew in her book. He said Mayhew was mentioned because a draftsman working in his office in 1939 quit, going to work for one of the New Deal programs; what the draftsman said at the time was that he was bored by the work he had been doing. Mr. Rood said the draftsman was Vernon DeMaris who went on to become a Professor at U.C. Berkeley and one of the best known bay area designers and proponents of social housing. Mr. Rood showed one of Mayhew's early institutional buildings, the Alumni House at Mills College which was a large Moderne-Art Deco house with an almost imperceptible butterfly roof. He said this building was not noted as a cultural resource in the pretty extensive survey that Oakland did of its entire urban fabric in the early 1980s. He said Mayhew's published institutions include the Alumni House at U.C. Berkeley and a hospital structure in Walnut Creek, neither of which is landmarked. He said some thought he retired in the 1950s but there are a number of works after that time for example the Manning's, the University Club of Alameda County 1958; and Golden Gate Elementary in San Francisco in 1962. He said Mayhew did two Mannings Restaurants, one in Pasadena which was a mix of styles and the one in Ballard which is hard to associate with him. Both Mannings were anomalies in his portfolio.

Mr. Rood said that Mayhew's obituary cited his own home in Piedmont, but Serge Chermayeff was the designer with Mayhew the client and also the architect of record. He said Mr. Chermayeff produced 13 to 14 schemes and architect and client came to agreement. He said in the Avery Index which is an index of over 1300 Architectural publications has 24 citations of Clarence Mayhew, 96 of Serge Chermayeff, 127 for Mendolson, and 286 for Eero Saarinen. He said there aren't many mentions of Mayhew, not even at his alma mater.

Mr. Rood said there is one landmarked building that Mayhew was associated with: Bonita Hall, which was built in 1895 and remodeled in the 1930s by Mr. Mayhew. His changes to the building were minor. He said none of Mayhew's buildings anywhere have been designated as a historic or cultural resource.

Mr. Rood said Mayhew was best known for his house designs and that he is just now beginning to get a modest level of scholarly interest. He said the two restaurants were late in his career and were not a significant part. He was successful for residences, honorable mention; had some articles published in the 1940s and 1950s, no previous landmark designations and little or no academic interest and little or no ties to Googies. He said that in conclusion Mayhew was not a noted architect and that this building is not an outstanding example or even a good one of his work.

Judith Sobol, art and architecture consultant, presented information about Googie architecture. She was very involved in making recommendations to the preservation organizations of which buildings should be nominated for landmark designation and which should not. She said she has dealt a lot with the practical issues of landmark designation. Her written testimony was submitted to the Board as was her resume; she presented an overview of her resume. She gave a PowerPoint presentation; she described Schwab's Pharmacy as the quintessential Googie building, describing its front roof or front facade line and the signage pilon for the restaurant with the famous Schwab's sign. She said the practical issues of preservation are put into perspective in that Googie is quintessentially a southern California architectural style. She said another example of Googie architecture is Ships with its toaster on the counter and

that you could watch the Chef cooking. She said it was a quintessential Googie style with sign on a pilon connected to building; it exhibited all the space age stylistic characteristics about Googie. She said Googie was quintessentially about the future, it was never about the past. It was an architecture that made use of advancements of new materials and used those new materials to create new forms. She said the forms were, more often than not, related to the forms of Frank Lloyd Wright and to European Modernists. Ms. Sobol referred to Romeo's Time Square which is a Googie restaurant right near Los Angeles Museum of Art. She said at night there was something about the building that would make people want to come inside because of how it is lit, because of the inside/outside quality of the materials and because the entrances were enormously inviting. She said there was a lot of lighting inside that brightened the whole building from the exterior.

Ms. Sobol said that new forms of architecture associated with Googie were due to new materials like plastics, steel and glass. She said the Googie building would be transformed at night becoming almost spaceship-like. She said it would draw the public in because of all the lights; like entering the space age, it was all about the future. She said there was use of structural steel, signage. The landscaping was very important as the inside and outside were supposed to merge. She said every surface is reflective, glass, steel, plastic; the interior was a dynamic place to be; it was dynamic in materials, structure and plan. She said once inside, you were in a different place.

Ms. Sobol compared that to the interior plan of Manning's in 1964; the interior of Mannings was just rectilinear. She said there was nothing set on the diagonal; nothing to make you feel that you were going to a very exciting or space-age place. She said Googie signage was boisterous; the typography, form, and the variety of writing contributed to the exuberance of Googie Architecture. Manning's signage was not Googie; there was a lack of relation of sign to building. She said the interior was very unlike the exterior, there was nothing about exterior that made it work as a whole. She said the shapes inside were not dynamic, someone outside was not urged to come in and eat; an outsider wouldn't see the movement in the building. She said Googie was not referential; only want to think of future and space. She said Googie would not have historical references speaking in reference to the roofline; if the roof is referential it proves this is not a Googie building. She said because architectural historians can not agree on what the references in the Manning's might be is another proof this is not Googie. She said that Googie style is bright, futuristic, stops you in your tracks and makes you want to come in; Manning's does not meet the standard. She said rarity is not a standard for designation. She said many classic Googies did not get classified. She said she thought perhaps Seattle wasn't a Googie city because of the weather.

Jack McCullough said there is a lot at stake for the owner. He summarized his analysis of the applicability of the landmarks criteria. He said it does not meet Criterion D as it is a pastiche of styles and its method of construction is typical. It does not meet Criterion E as Clarence Mayhew was not an outstanding architect and his eclectic approach was a pastiche of different designs. With regard to Criterion F he said it would be difficult to find a building that would be designated based on this alone; there is no objective standard. He said the building is not readily visible and is dwarfed by neighboring structures. He said the location of this building gives it prominence, not the building itself.

Mr. McCullough said Mr. Johnson looked at the threshold question of integrity and significance. He said this building has little significance so integrity is absolutely important. He said there have been structures in the city that have more significance where the Board in the past has been willing to maybe bend its understanding of integrity; this is not the case here. In looking at integrity, 72% of the original glazing is gone or covered up; the entrance has been redesigned, the interior has been gutted and completely redesigned; the vertical supports and the glu lam beams had begun to fail within ten years of original construction and would have failed years ago but for the steel. He said if this building were to be landmarked, would one be landmarking the timbers that were originally there or the steel that now makes them real. He said the roof has been punctuated by major signboxes. He referred to the mechanical plenum that was originally used to create a clean roof form and to hide all the mechanical equipment has been obliterated and replaced by a series of roof top units almost to the height of the new Denny's signs on the roof. He said the changes were made because the building did not work as it was designed; the structural elements within ten years were rotting in place due partially to the drain pipes leading directly down to the base of the wood timbers, the glazing pattern which was important in Googie but so irrelevant to this building in its function that it could be disposed of by the next user, and the roof top mechanical space which was a thoughtful approach but was too compromised in space to be able to survive the future use of building.

Mr. McCullough asked the Board to deny designation. He said to designate this building is to try to satisfy sentimental yearnings for coffee houses and for places we all spent time at in past. He said that Al Michaels suggested that there was an uprising in 1984 to save the building; as Mr. Symington said this was not the case. He said the remodel didn't happen because of difficulty getting permits out of DPD so they ended up reusing this building. He said that others today will talk of uprising now to save this building. He said that his survey work indicated that 60% of those in the area were opposed to landmarking. He said this is the Landmarks Preservation Board not the Landmarks Renovation Ordinance; what you see when you act on this building, if you were to designate, is what you get. He said the building which was not well-designed in 1964 functionally and has been deteriorating and has been altered in the 40 years since then, is not ultimately something the Board can save. He said the Landmark Preservation Board is a civic board and operates within a civic and political process in the City of Seattle. He said as a Board your most precious asset is your credibility in this political process. He said the credibility of the Board is at stake; over 30 years the bar of significance and integrity has been high and by voting to designate this building this will be undermined. The staff has recommended against designation and he recommended the Board pay close attention to that recommendation. He said this building is many things but it is not outstanding and is not a landmark.

Board Questions:

Mr. Abelsen asked about determination to be Googie.

Mr. Johnson said he learned a lot about Googie and perception has changed.

Mr. Abelsen asked how all of it could all fit into these categorizations.

Mr. Johnson said regarding category D it has to be compared with other contemporary buildings that were being done at that time.

Ms. Sobol said she once heard the widow of an architect talk about a building her husband had designed that had been built very differently from the design say, "my husband always said that's not architecture- it's construction". She said that sometimes people of very good faith make bad decisions about what buildings are going to look like. She said this building is a pastiche of a whole lot of stuff that can only be described as mid century historian gone.

Mr. Lee asked if the coffee shop Ships was still there.

Ms. Sobol replied, no; that Los Angeles has a good stock of Googie style buildings but they are losing them.

Mr. Martinson said the tails of the glulam have been trimmed off.

Mr. Johnson said there were no flashings on overhangs so tails cut off in the 1970s.

Mr. Martinson said there are upswept beams at entry.

Mr. Johnson said there are two at the original entry where it was covered; the northern side still has upswept beams.

Mr. Veith said, when looking at Criterion D dealing with visible characteristic of an architectural style or period, or a method of construction, that one thing he noticed about a lot of the letters and various reports is they focus quickly on Googie. Without there being any demonstrable intent from Architect, he asked why is so much time being spent s discussing this because there are other characteristics to discuss for example, the Polynesian Character. He said he remembers the neighborhood planning Polynesian parties with tiki torches and it doesn't seem like anyone has spent much time trying to disabuse that association. He said the other thing that is striking about the photo of the original interior, there were other restaurants that had that style interior with the regularity of space, most of which are gone. He asked why he shouldn't, as a Board member, look at the period and say this is a good example of architecture that is very distinctive of that period, or why not of the method of construction.

Mr. Johnson said he grew up here and remembers several restaurants at that period of time. He said the Canlis is still standing; Sambo's on Aurora was the closet to Googie style but was remodeled. He said the buildings he more specifically remembers from that period are Paul Bunyan room in Northgate, the Windjammer at Shilshole. He said he doesn't think this building can't hold a candle to the others. He said Manning's is a good building but as Ms. Sobol said, was cloistered. He said it inappropriately designed given the large glazing areas in the south. He said glu lam was very popular at the time and the beams were the most significant thing on this building. He said the were manufactured in Bellingham by an off shoot of a shipyard; they took the same technology from building wood bents for frames of a hull and started using that to build buildings. He said they had been doing that since the 1950s, so by 1963 competition stepped in and the company went out of business shortly after.

Mr. McCullough said it does not pass the integrity threshold; it is a pastiche and not a style.

Ms. Sobol said there is no unity that makes a single statement. She said from every place she stood and looked at the building she got a different idea of what it was. She said she thought that perhaps the architect was having a wonderful time using things that he'd never used before but that doesn't really produce a building that works for the public and should not be distinguished as a landmark.

Ms. Tremaine asked what the booth at the World's Fair looked like.

Mr. Johnson said he showed it during the presentation.

Ms. Tremaine asked if Mayhew could have adapted it.

Mr. Hannum asked if there were other examples of Googie use.

Ms. Sobol said the same notion that led to coffee shop modern probably led to Googie motels, Googie car washes, and perhaps to playground equipment. She said there was something about the style that is a populist style, that draws people in. She said that is one reason modernism was acceptable in those uses and not in office buildings. Googie was embraced; it was like a comic book and people loved it.

Ms. Howard asked of Arthur Chang if the glu-lam was modified for HVAC system.

Arthur Chang said he wasn't sure if it was for the HVAC system but that there was not enough room so when they put the ceilings in there wasn't enough room because of the curves, so they cut them back.

Ms. Chave read the staff report. She said the Staff does not recommend the designation of the Manning's Cafeteria/Ballard Denny's at 5501 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW as a Seattle Landmark, as it does not have the integrity or ability to convey its significance, as required by SMC 25.12.350.

While the building retains its exterior form and roof shape, there have been well-documented, extensive alterations to the fenestration and storefront materials to the exterior. More importantly, the interior of the building has been significantly altered in terms of character- defining volume, plan, materials and finishes. It is important to note that the Board's decision must be made based on the current physical appearance of the subject building and not the possibility of restoration.

In response to a citizen's comment letter (Eugenia Woo) comparing the Board's designation of the Central Waterfront Piers, Yesler Houses, Japanese Language School, and the Joshua Green Building to the Ballard Denny's, as examples of physically altered landmarks, it is an incomplete and misleading comparison. If a building is over a hundred years old or almost that age, it is rare if it has not undergone some type of renovation or remodeling from the original construction. Considering that the Central Waterfront Piers and the Yesler Houses, two of the examples referred to in her report are more than 100 years

old, it is not unexpected that they would incur physical changes as the buildings are adapted to new uses. In the case of the Japanese Language School, which was designated under Designation Standards A and C, the buildings have very strong historical and social associations with and significance to the City. There is no doubt that there have been changes to the buildings but the Board found that the physical condition was still able to convey the integrity of its association with relevant landmark criteria.

The significant features of the John Graham-designed Joshua Green Building that make it an outstanding example of an early twentieth century Seattle “skyscraper” have been retained since its construction in 1912. Like all downtown buildings, many of which have been nominated and designated by the Board, most have extensive storefront alterations.

Public Comment:

Mr. Lee asked public comment to be limited to two minutes and said the Board can only consider aspects related to the landmarks criteria as in the Code and nothing to do with future development.

Anne Forestieri referred to a 1964 PI article calling the building “Rakish Radical Remarkable”. She said she is part of a group of citizens who came together because of their mutual interest in this building. She said she supports the designation of this building because its distinctive architecture is unlike other building in the City or the region and is viewed by many as a modern landmark. She said this is about the building and its merits for nomination under Criteria C, D, E, and F. She said they advocate for development where the existing building is preserved and have an architect who has provided a viable alternate solution for this site. She said they uncovered a great deal of additional material in their research including locating the original photographer Edward Johanson. She said she also met Charlie Jenner of Elan Construction Company who was the original contractor; he is in audience today. She said the community support and memories for this building have been remarkable in keeping with the original Seattle Post Intelligencer headline.

Eugenia Woo from DOCOMOMO said she is a Ballard resident, concerned citizen and historic preservation consultant but she is not being paid for her comments. She said the original building had character-defining features which is essential in reviewing any nomination either or local or national level. She said in the report she submitted to the Board she established how to evaluate integrity and called out the character-defining features and she said she also demonstrated that the building has integrity. She said a building does not have to be in pristine condition or unaltered to be a landmark; there are many buildings that are landmarked that have some degree of alteration in the interior and exterior. She provided examples: the Japanese Language School, the Yesler Houses and the Marine Warehouses. The Manning’s building has retained character defining characteristics though some features have been lost and it has the ability to convey its significance. She said there is a difference between integrity that has been lost and features that have been covered over but are still there and preserved. She asked the Board to designate the exterior and interior features that are still intact.

Mildred Andrews said she is an historian and a preservationist and asked the Board to consider the significance of Manning’s Inc. in the history of Seattle. She referred to a



booklet published in 1978 by Manning's Inc. on their 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary; the booklet was called "Manning's, Pioneers in Food Service Management". She said in 1908 William and Edward Manning opened the coffee business at the then-new Pike's Place Market. Starbucks wasn't the first Seattle coffee chain to open there. Manning's Inc. expanded quickly with public cafeterias, coffee shops and food services for hospitals and businesses. By 1978 the firm operated more than 250 food services in 12 western states. She said the sales were \$90 million per year. Ballard Manning's was the last restaurant the firm built; it was a jewel in Manning's corporate crown. Ballardites proudly called it the "Taj Mahal" of Ballard. She said she supports the designation.

Mr. Lee said the Board has already read letters that have come in and asked that comments be limited to just reiterate the points rather than reading the letters.

Alan Michaelson said he has written a number of the reports that the Board has received. He said he is an architectural historian with a PHD from Stanford; he studied in the Bay Area for 10 years and said he is well aware of Bay Area architecture and its history. He said he also has a Library of Science degree from the University of Michigan. He brought with him Googie books written by Alan Hess who wrote two letters that stated this building is Googie. He said the Board has a letter from Sally Woodbridge, a very important Bay Area architectural historian who wrote of the importance of Clarence Mayhew. He said Jeffrey Ochsner, who Mr. Michaels referred to as the Dean of architectural historians in the Pacific Northwest, said written a letter of endorsement saying that this is an important Googie building. He said the people that Benaroya and Rhapsody Partners have present earlier are not historians and they are not on par with these published historians. He said there were many errors in fact in earlier presentations.

Ralph Allan said regarding Criterion F he takes exception to narrow view that it must be visible for several blocks. It is lower scale with an interesting roof form that creates a gesture of welcome to Ballard. He is in favor of the building as it relates to Criterion F. He said with regard to physical integrity he hasn't seen modifications to beams but they appear to be in good condition as are the original battens that hold panels in. He said there is a lot of talk about the window wall being modified; the existing vertical wood mullions are still intact in the entire building; they were just filled in with other material.

Eric Pihl said he supports designation based on C, D, and F. He said there is overwhelming community support. He said that important voices from experts in the field:, Kate Krafft, Aaron Markovich of the Vernacular Architecture Forum, Jeffrey Ochsner, David Streatfield, The Washington Trust, The National Trust for Historic Preservation, Sally Woodbridge and Alan Hess, all of whom support designation for this structure. He read a couple comments from Alan Hess email after Hess had a chance to read Mr. Rood's report:" the fact that Mayhew may have had no other landmarked buildings is irrelevant to the issue of this historical quality of this building. He said many architects now noted were not recognized for years after their death; for example, Rudolf Steindler and Charles and Henry Green. Mayhew was recognized and published in major journals in the prime of his career as Rood's report documents. He said like many other good architects his work was neglected by later historians but it can not be inferred that it was because he was not significant. He said the report does not really analyze the historic record of Mayhew's design

work, though Rood does provide the most complete review of Mayhew's work I've ever seen. He said it can be documented, however, that Mayhew's work is today attracting historians reassessing the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Charles Jenner, the construction contractor for the original building, said the glu lam beams were complicated and he searched all over for glu-lam. He said he had done many jobs but this one was the best he ever got into. He said there were challenges; the glu lam beams were the most complicated ever designed. He found a manufacturer in Bellingham. He commented on the great ambience of the arched ceiling and that it was the greatest vaulted ceiling in Seattle. He said the dropped ceiling was a horrible mistake and it took away the ambience. He supports designation.

Pandora Touart said she is in favor of designation and that she is a 30-year resident of Queen Anne and Ballard. She said the mental map of the built environment constitutes a sense of place. She said this unique building as entrance to downtown Ballard is unique in its structure and unique to the community. She said if being dwarfed has some bearing on historic viability then we might as well write off all the one and two story structures in town. She said that downtown Ballard has been defined by this structure for many decades; it deserves to be preserved with the same imagination that put it up.

Ken Alhadeff said the Board has an awesome responsibility and it is complicated decision. He said he is opposed to designation and he doesn't like to be opposed to anything. His family has been there for six generations and they have participated mightily in historic preservation. He said historic preservation the word preservation means to preserve something and the question then needs to be for what, and why, and how. He said that when he looks at the facility as it sits today in the condition it is in, if the Board chooses to designate it must be able to answer, "and then what?" He asked what is the next step in the life of the building if it is preserved. Who will restore it? Who will retain it? What will it be? He said he thinks historic preservation is essential to our character, to our fabric to our lives. Who we were is who we are; it speaks to our civility and our dignity but there needs to be balance in it. He said for those reasons he does not support the designation.

Jim King said there is an urban village in Ballard; he said he thinks having that property be developed will allow people to "live, work and play" and will create the urban village that has been talked about. He is opposed to designation.

Chris Moore, Field Director Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, and says the Washington Trust supports designation based on D and F. He said the research shows key character-defining features of the building are intact and do remain in place, particularly the expressive flowing roof form, the enamel porcelain panels that exist under the row of glazing, some windows still remain under the plywood; the fenestration pattern remains intact and the mullions are original and remain. He said they are character-defining elements that allow the building to convey its significance under Criteria D and F. It is representative of Googie and there are examples in the Northwest; it is a multi-faceted use of Googie design to address questions of marketing. He said the roof form is a sign for building.

Jennifer Bent said she is a community member in Seattle. She said no to designation; it isn't appropriate.

Sandra Hughes said she wants the City to listen to the smaller, ordinary people who might want to go get a hamburger or a waffle in the middle of the night and can't afford the \$125 restaurants. She said Penny's was taken away and Kress and now they are taking Denny's and will take Sunset Bowl. She said another speaker talked about neighboring buildings, she said they are blah, big and square and ugly. She said this building has class, and has the common person in mind and Seattle is losing that. She said the builders want that corner for the money and this is not about money, it is about people and their needs, that love Seattle and they are asking the Board to keep the building to listen to the community.

Christine Leander said she is a 35 year resident of Ballard. She said she supports designation and said the building is already a landmark to the community. She said to ask anyone about the building and it is already a landmark.

Arlen Collins said he has been practicing architecture in Seattle for about 35 years and said ten buildings he has designed have been torn down. He said he would say the same thing about all the buildings he has designed that this group has said about Manning's: they're innovative, they're ahead of their time, and they're landmarks, but they are gone because something else has happened that economically had to happen to move us forward. He said there is nothing left to save. He asked if the building is landmarked, how it will be saved. He said the intention is great but landmarking it doesn't save it.

Board discussion:

Mr. Veith said of Criterion A and B, there is no historical event, no person associated with the building that is significant. He said that regarding criterion C; is the building a significant aspect of the community, he said he hasn't noted any special significance for Manning's in the cultural development or economic heritage of the community. Criterion D; does it embody characteristic of an architectural style, period or method of construction, he said as he read through the letters and reports and that a lot of the argument went to discussion of whether or not it is Googie. He said being able to apply a label to it is not as important as looking at the other characteristics of the building, of how it might be important in the City as an indicator of a way to build structures. He said this is complicated by the fact that a lot of the interior features at floor level have been removed and those above floor level have been hidden. He said it was interesting to him in the tour that not only the bents were still up in the plenum but also the batten system and original ceiling covering. He said they could tell by looking at the back of the outside walls that the mullion system was still there. The material in place of the glazing had not replaced the glazing system. He said he thinks there is a lot of the fabric that is still there. On the outside there is the discussion about how much of the structure was modified. He said the bents were indeed modified on the east side by removal of a small piece of detail. He said there are bents that appear not to have been modified; the ones with the big upturned ends near the rear entry were, the others appear not to have projected that far out according to the drawings. He said the concrete columns are still there, the panels under windows are still there. He said the glazing could be replaced in the existing mullions. He said, however, that the building has to be dealt

with as it is. He said there is a lot of fabric that is not visible now, and even if it were to be landmarked we can't make the next owner bring those details back only suggest they do it. He said he is on the fence on this Criterion. Although he thinks there is a lot of character defining fabric there, it is just not usable at this time. With respect to Criterion E, it is hard to define this building as an outstanding work of this designer. He said the designer, as did many architects of this period, had a variety of approaches that he took. He started out with academic eclecticism and moved toward modernism. He said a designer has a client and doesn't always get to do what he wants to do. He said this building doesn't seem unusual in his work and is not particularly outstanding. He said regarding Criterion F, the building seems to fall into the traditional meaning of landmark; it sticks in your mind. It is a building that sticks in your mind and you use it for navigation or to remind yourself where you are. Because of the distinct roof form, the exterior does function as landmark. Of the four corners it is the only building that is set at the corner; at the other three corners the buildings are set back. He said it's always been a landmark for him and from commentary it seems to serve that same function for others as well. He asked "does it contribute to the distinctive quality or identity of the neighborhood"? He is on the fence as to whether this represents a distinct quality of the neighborhood. He said he associates it with the neighborhood and he thinks other people do. Of the six criteria, he said this is the one he would be most likely to adopt; he said he wanted to hear from the rest of the Board. A, B, C, and E: No; D is iffy; F is a good possibility.

Mr. Martinson said he would vote no on A, B, C. By way of precedent on this Board we have not needed a word to describe a style. He said it has distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style which will remain unnamed. He said it is not a unique curved glu-lam building but the curved glu-lam is rarely used and this is a good example. Glu-lams are intact except for a few that were removed and some are showing more deterioration. He said no to E. He doesn't think it is an outstanding work of the architect. He said there is a good case for F because in his experience, and the experience of many who testified, it is a landmark that functions almost as entry to Ballard. Because of changes he said he has a hard time crossing the integrity threshold.

Ms. Strong referred to Criterion D that it does convey characteristic of style, be it Googie or something else. She said that F is the most solid criteria that she could support designation on because it does present physical characteristic of neighborhood somewhat as witnessed by the letters and documentation of reports. She said the integrity of existing elements is questionable though.

Mr. Abelsen said he is impressed by the showing of citizens on both sides which helps to show how important landmarking these buildings is to the City. He said the counsel for the applicant said early on that we have a threshold level that helps to determine what a landmark is. He said he wanted to commend Mr. Johnson on an excellent presentation and for doing further study to clarify conditions at the building. He said the experts from California helped to winnow the questions of the relevance of the architect, or of the Googie style. He said there is still conflict between what Mr. Hess and Ms. Sobol define as Googie; he is not convinced it is Googie. He said that what is at hand is if this building is a landmark, and that what is significant is its roof form which is undeniably identifiable, to itself and to its area. Whether it is representative of Ballard or the City is a far reach. What it does represent is that of

an auto oriented society, and when the Manning's was put up in its time is significant. He said he would support designation under criteria D and F.

Ms. Tremaine said regarding D, the building is not Norwegian. Regarding E she said that Mayhew was an interesting but not special architect. She said she thinks it is whimsical, not Googie. She said she thought it was fun to see it when it was first built; now it is like a roadside attraction. She said regarding the siting referred to in Criterion F she interpreted to mean "extreme siting" such as the bathhouse at Golden Gardens or the hilltop siting at Douglas Truth Library, not the intersection at the location of Denny's in Ballard. She said the building is in terrible shape and she said it doesn't convey its historic or architectural significance.

Ms. Nicolas said regarding Criterion D she read an article about longhouse vernacular and in comparison with other vernacular architect that she looked at last year, she is very attracted to the populist style it conveys but she thinks it doesn't have enough integrity to convey that. Regarding F, it is a strong icon to community. She is on the fence with Criterion F.

Ms. Howard said she would be looking at this with regard to Criterion D and F. With regard to Criterion F, she said it is not on a prominent site like a hill, but she does think the contrast of siting and the way it contrasts with surrounding buildings speaks to its age. She said the roofline has a lot to do with that. She said in terms of criterion D she is not sure it is Googie but the Criterion references period and method of construction as well as style. She thinks it is very distinctly 1960s and the method of construction is distinctive. She said she is struggling with integrity. She said there have been lots of alterations; she said it is an integrity issue.

Mr. Hannum said he was impressed by all the thought; he was swayed back and forth. He appreciated all the information that was presented. Based on the information he will rule out E. With regard to D he is not sure of Googie issue although it has a distinctive 1960s shape. Criterion F is somewhat undeniable in that it is on the corner and identifiable. He said if restored it could work. He said unfortunately he can't make determination in subjunctive so the way it stands, condition can't convey significance, so, no, he will not support designation.

Mr. Lee said he had mixed opinions. He was not swayed by integrity issues as we still have many buildings with integrity issues (recently the Bon Marche stables) where we still designated that building. D: this is Seattle and like some of us on this floor we come from somewhere else and many building that are called styles that they are not. It may well be Googie, and he thinks Mayhew may have been copying the World's Fair ticket booth. He said it does portray a building of the 1960s. F: He says he lives near the building and sees it as a visual landmark. He said it reminds him of the deliberations about the bathhouse at Golden Gardens which bookends its end of Ballard; a lot thought that should be a landmark. He said to him this building bookends the other end of Ballard; there is enough integrity to convey significance. He said he would vote yes.

Ms. Howard said Mr. Lee convinced her.

Mr. Veith said the most obvious glu-lams are also the two in the worst condition. He said at least in the lower portion of the building, are a series of four columns that

have all been replaced with steel. He said they did maintain proportions of the existing structure and even utilized the wood detail at the base; that could be an integrity issue for Criterion F. He said he was surprised that there weren't more comparative slides of churches which often have Glu-lam. It is hard to get away from expectation of seeing the Denny's as one approaches Ballard. He said the exterior maintains more of its integrity than the interior; he would be sad to see remainder of interior to go unutilized but maybe it would be fairer to only designate the exterior, understanding that it has been modified with the steel reinforcement and replacement.

Mr. Lee said that Mr. Mathews supported designation in a letter that he submitted.

Ms. Howard asked how significant the interior is for purposes for designation.

Ms. Lee said the changes were superficial and cosmetic; the drop ceiling can be removed. He said he was taken by Mr. Jenner's comment that it is the greatest vaulted ceiling in Seattle. He said he thought that a remarkable statement.

Mr. Martinson said the windows are gone but the mullions are there; it seems this has come up in other structures.

Mr. Abelsen said are we missing windows or are we missing the glass; here it is just the glass.

Ms. Tremaine said that Mr. Chang's presentation with highlighted colors on drawing really illustrated the changes.

Mr. Hannum said he is concerned how poorly it has held up over relatively short period of time.

Mr. Lee asked if the Board was ready to make a motion.

Mr. Veith said that he said if he included the interior it would be a real headache for staff because they have to negotiate a controls and incentive agreement that controls hidden materials, and if you don't consider the hidden materials there isn't enough integrity inside to designate. He said that staff has recommended against designation and probably specifically one of the reasons would be that; that in its current condition it doesn't have integrity in the interior.

Action:

"I move that the Board approve the designation of the Manning's Cafeteria/Ballard Denny's at 5501 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard F; that the features and characteristics identified for preservation include the exterior of the building."

**MM/SC/TV/VA**

6:3:0 (Ms. Tremaine, Ms. Strong,  
Mr. Hannum opposed) Motion carried.

**022008.4      NOMINATIONS**

022008.41      Charlestown Court  
3811 California Ave SW

Applicant Presentation: David Petersen from Nicholson Kovalchick Architects presented the nomination. He provided relevant background information: the neighborhood context, and site, interior, exterior, and historic West Seattle. The building is a four unit apartment building that was built in 1927 by William H. Whitely. The building was built for W. McCormack and is located at California Avenue SW at Charlestown Street. The building is currently owned by Stephen Butler and Paul Cesmat. California Avenue SW is mixed commercial. Using graphics he showed the location of the units in a U-shaped apartment building with two garages in the back. California Avenue SW, which is the major north-south arterial, is mixed commercial along length with a variety of commercial and apartment buildings from different eras and immediately off a single family residential area. The site is 117 x 83; rectangle; 64 x 64' building, with an 18' x 38' courtyard. The "U" opens to California Avenue; behind are two garage buildings with four gravel parking areas. There is single family residential across alley. To the south of the site is a townhouse development that was built in 2006. There are mature deciduous trees along California Avenue. A new apartment building is to the south. On the north side is a 7-11 store. Across the street is a popular neighborhood restaurant.

Mr. Petersen said that a 1937 photo shows the exterior walls clad in dark red and purple brick in a simple running bond. It is a U-shape building with a continuous ridge line, the four apartments, one in each wing with two in center of "U". Underneath the central third is a basement which is accessed from the alley side. Gable ends are prominent and the architectural style is Tudor which was popular in the 1920s.

Mr. Petersen said the roof sweeps down to engage two arched openings that provide access to the sides building. Since this photo there has been development around it so it is more difficult to see the side. Today, there is a slight batter to the two chimneys, and a slight flair to brick work at bottom. There is an S-shape tie rod at the top presumably decorative. The roof is 3 tab roof composite shingle. Each entry is accessed off the courtyard with a projecting, bracketed porchlet, which provides an entry for each unit. In the central unit there is a double porch with concrete steps. Where the northwest unit is the open gabled porch provides some asymmetry to project. He said windows are a variety of casement, fixed, and double hung windows about half of which have been replaced. On the street prominent side the windows were leaded. The screen doors not original. The courtyard is the defining element. There is landscaping all around the building with foundation plantings in the courtyard, on the sides and in the rear also. He showed a view of one of the entries showing metal mailbox and receptacle adjacent to doorway. The building has had little or no alteration. The side path gate to back doors of units; each unit has a back door accessed from the side entrance.

Mr. Petersen said the upper window lights an unoccupied attic space. The rear of building has a raised walkway, basement windows with steps going down to access the boiler and mechanical, asymmetrical back entry to basement; two garages with siding designed to hold two cars a piece. As for the condition of the brick; it is old

and has suffered from some settling, from earthquake damage, fissures, some plant growth, water damage and the whole thing probably needs repointing.

Mr. Petersen showed photos of typical living room, two units in central part as opposed to wing units. The apartment had coved ceilings, a picture rail, and an interesting fake fireplace. He showed another photo of one of the wing units with and the unusual firebox which was originally an electric fireplace, with tile, and cast stone hearth. He showed photo of dining room with plate rail, coved ceiling, baseboard trim, oak floor under carpet. Two of the units are two-bedroom, two are one-bedroom. Kitchen has not been updated, the tile varies.

Mr. Petersen said that Seattle was booming; population in 1900 was 80,000. In 1920 population was 237,000. In 1907 West Seattle was annexed to the City which is why 1910 census numbers jumped so much. West Seattle had some development during that time; the beachfront became a summer resort for wealthy people. In the Duwamish area there began to be shipbuilding enterprises but it was not until 1907 that it took off. In 1902 the original area that had been platted and is now the Admiral area, that became West Seattle. They were able to issue bonds to connect West Seattle to mainland. They extended the first streetcar line in the country and then sold it to the City of Seattle. In 1924 permanent concrete bridge was built connecting the mainland part of Seattle to West Seattle. After this it began to boom. In 1917 photo can see it was the top of the plateau that really began to take off and the Junction and Fauntleroy with California Avenue its main spine.

Mr. Petersen said that Charlestown Court may qualify as a bungalow type which is a building type that has a complicated history. It is a term that is misused frequently. In order to standardize understanding what bungalow court is he said he wanted to use an earlier 2004 report for the Reed Court which was on Capital Hill. There was supplemental information that was attached that was done by the Johnson Partnership Architects. What they tried to do is inventory all the bungalow courts and create a typological system of what a bungalow court is. He said in a nutshell it is a housing type that developed from a Craftsman bungalow which is a small cottage and became very popular in South California because it was small and had a direct connection to nature, usually by a prominent porch. It had a kind of detailing and expression of materials that utilized wood and stone. It was single story; a two story is usually called a Craftsman House. A bungalow is like a cottage and all the living spaces come off the main living room which is connected to a large porch that is connected to nature. They were very popular in the late 1800s and early 1900s in Southern California and it began to take off all over the west including Seattle.

Mr. Petersen said 1907-1920 architects in Los Angeles began to cluster cottages together to attract "snowbird" travelers to California instead of staying in motel. Each building is slightly different. Usually it is a courtyard design, pedestrian space, with a gateway. The Johnson Partnership developed four criteria for what constitutes a bungalow court: single story, usually detached but at least differentiated units grouped around a pedestrian court; court entered from street usually through a gateway; transitional private space, to porch/stoop; and then generally Craftsman detail within each one. He said this is an ideal and if this is an ideal, how close are you to this. He said that one thing that happened over time is when these projects were developed in areas that didn't have as much free land as Los Angeles did, the courtyard space would be come smaller, perhaps just a pedestrian walkway rather



than a focused area. The detached units began to be attached units, creating a U-shape or sometimes with spaces between the three parts of the U.

Mr. Petersen said the prototypical project for the bungalow court from 1915 is on an urban infill lot, so not nearly as much space between units and the courtyard has become more of a pedestrian pathway but the cottages are clearly cottages, there's an individual porch, there is a gateway, it happens to have Craftsman detailing because it was from that period. They are generally single story units with some attic space. It is a pretty good example of how close are you to the standard. In the 1920s there began to be less of an interest in Craftsman and a more period revival in Tudor. In looking at the bulleted list of what the ideal bungalow court is, this meets some of the qualities and it has the gateway and lovely courtyard, individualized entrances. He said however what is happening is that another type of building, called the garden or townhouse apartment begins to create a sliding scale of what constitutes a bungalow court. Based on these criteria, yes this would qualify as a bungalow court because it mostly meets the qualifications. In this case it has three buildings with the sort of pedestrian garden park pathways in between, there is a gated entry but this one accommodates automobiles which were becoming more popular in the 1920s.

Mr. Petersen said this would not be a bungalow court; it would be qualified more as a garden court townhouse. The scale of it is enormous, it accommodates automobiles. He showed comparison of Charlestown Court with apartment units constructed in the 1940s. The Architect William H. Whitely was a prolific architect in the 1920s; he was Canadian and born in the 1892 and died in 1974. He moved to Seattle in the 1920s and worked in a variety of styles that were popular in the 1920s. He did apartment buildings, single family residences and commercial buildings. Some of the buildings he was the developer and some were done with Frederick Anhalt who was one of the most prominent apartment developers in the 1920s. Anhalt was not involved in Charlestown Court. But around this time Whitely was working with Anhalt. Whitely also did double loaded apartment buildings on Capital and Beacon Hills.

Staff recommends the nomination of the Charlestown Court at 3811 California Ave SW based on the following designation standard:

*It embodies the distinctive visible characteristics of an architectural style, period, or of a method of construction.*

Staff recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building, and the site.

Board Questions:

Mr. Veith asked if asked if he agreed with staff recommendation concerning nomination

Mr. Peterson said nomination was submitted as part of land use and SEPA process.

Mr. Peterson said it is not a bungalow court, it more a garden apartment in poor condition. He said about half the windows have been replaced. He said it is nicely scaled but there are better examples in Seattle including ones by this architect.

Ms. Tremaine asked if any bungalow courts or garden courts landmarked.

Ms. Chave said the last major presentation of a bungalow court was in 2004 with Reed Court. She said as you saw in Mr. Peterson's presentation and in supplemental information that was referenced from the Johnson Partnership there are a lot of bungalow courts in Seattle but they haven't come before the Board. She said the only one she could think of that was under consideration was Reed Court and Allison Court which were both denied by the Board.

Mr. Peterson said that on the DON site there are frequently buildings using the Johnson Partnership standards that are called bungalow courts that are actually not

Ms. Chave said that is on the survey.

Ms. Tremaine asked if there was a specific reason not to nominate the interior because the fireplace situation seems quite unusual.

Ms. Chave said it clearly looked like the exterior features were the character defining features. Even though the interior very nice it didn't happen to have anything more significant than others. There wasn't really a central entrance lobby.

#### Public Comment:

Larry Johnson said the apartment is characteristically a bungalow court because you basically do enter through a courtyard to individual unit where a row of house – it really doesn't matter what type because they really are low rise housing types. He said that Ms. Chave pointed out some time ago that sometimes it is unfair to compare worker type housing to higher end units like Montrose Court. They are problematic because good development site and he thinks a lot of them will eventually change to condo units because that is the only way to save them. This is pretty good, better than Adrian Court and better than Reed Court. It was worker housing along streetcar line.

#### Board Comments:

Mr. Hannum said he agrees with D, he is on the fence, he said he is concerned with the windows that were replaced.

Ms. Howard said it was not high budget, nice example; current conditions create an integrity issue. She is on the fence but if she supports it would be based on D.

Ms. Nicolas said yes on D.

Ms. Tremaine said yes on D

Mr. Abelsen acknowledged Mr. Johnson's comments about the difficulty to identify this as a significant structure. He said that it has a unique street front; it has some asymmetry that is unique, he supports the nomination but wants to take a closer look at the building.

Ms. Strong said no; she lived in an Anhalt courtyard building and this building is wedged between 2 ½ story townhouse complex to the south and a 7-11 so it is lost in streetscape and with the condition of brick, loss of windows it does not say landmark.

Mr. Martinson said it just barely has significant character, interest or value but thinks he will support the nomination for further study.

Mr. Veith said staff identified the only criteria by which it would be malleable for landmark status. This is another case of a nice building but it is difficult to see its significance. He said he would tend to not go for it.

Mr. Lee said he is not sure; it is a lovely design; he is taken by asymmetry and would like to study it more. He might say yes to D.

**Action:**

I move approval of the Charlestown Court at 3811 California Ave SW for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the building and the site; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation be scheduled for April 2, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.

**MM/SC/MT/RM**

6:3:0 (Ms. Strong, Ms. Howard and Mr. Hannum opposed.

022008.42

Women's University Club  
1105 Sixth Avenue

Applicant Comments: Kate Krafft said the building was built in 1922 with expansion to a new addition in 1962. It sits at the northwest corner of Spring and 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. The Women's University Club (WUC) was established in 1914. It was adjacent to the College Club and members of both clubs were closely affiliated. The WUC served as an educational organization and social gathering place. It was open to all women with a university or college degree. In the early years there were few attractive places in downtown Seattle for women to dine. By 1914 friends who used to cluster together lived in City suburban neighborhoods so there was a need for a central place to meet.

In 1914 the original clubhouse was constructed by the Metropolitan Building Company for the club and was designed by A. H. Albertson. The original clubhouse was a one story building with formal entry vestibule off of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, with a lounge room with fireplace and main dining room. By 1914 the club had 270 members and the club functioned as a literary and artistic center, and for both political and social activities. In 1920 the original clubhouse was razed to build the Olympic Hotel so the new building was constructed to meet the multi-purpose needs of the club including easily accessible ballroom for rentals and guest facilities.

A.H. Albertson and E. F. Champney were the architects; Mr. Champney was a proponent of Beaux Arts style. Ms. Krafft said the building had a basement level, two floor levels, third floor level and a recessed entry way and stairs off Spring Street. Champney is best known for the YWCA Building. There were few local architects with formal Beaux Arts education obtained in Paris. At the turn of the century he had worked on a number of international expositions in the planning and design of the layout and the buildings; he came to Seattle to work on the Alaskan Yukon Pacific Exposition. The New Richmond Hotel and YWCA are the most important that Champney did. Albertson arrived about the same time working on the design and development of the University tract. Early on he established a firm with Paul Richardson and Joseph Wilson worked for him and later they established a partnership. Among their buildings are the St. Joe's Church on Capital Hill, Cornish School, the YMCA and the Northern Life Tower.

The building originally was to be a three story building per original drawings, the women raised funds and sold bonds; at the time they were getting their permits they could only afford a two story but eventually got the funds to add a third floor.

The exterior of the building has many attributes of the original 1914 clubhouse: it had the same window element and was also designed by A. H. Albertson. She said the building is a Georgian Revival style with a broad base that becomes intermediate cornice as the building descends downhill. There is a series of window placements that vary by floor level, a formal entry off of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and a prominent dentil course at the cornice. The new clubhouse raised maximum membership to 900 members; during the Depression numbers dwindled and the club faced financial issues. During the late 1930s and the WWII the guest facilities were used a lot due to the number of women who were in transit or were being relocated due to employment or educational opportunities. In the 1950s the membership went up to 1000 members and they purchased an adjacent lot for a parking lot.

During this era many guest rooms were converted to classrooms or other purposes and increasingly the clubhouse was used primarily for education, entertainment, luncheon and dinner programs. In the late 1950s there was consideration to relocate to the suburbs but the members chose to remodel to meet their changing needs. In 1962 the firm of Durham, Anderson and Fried was hired to design an addition to the club on parking lot side. By 1974 the WUC was no longer classified as a women's residential club.

The building has a wide base that wraps the building and becomes an intermediate cornice interconnected with the entry and ballroom and assembly space. She showed the terracotta work at entry and said that the entry canopy was one of the few alterations to the exterior of the building with the security gate and the broken parapet design above the door. She said there are subtle variations in the fenestration. There is a recessed bay with the two side bays and the variation in the treatment of the window openings with the multipaned window sash. She said it is almost identical to the windows at the original club with the wide trim, 12/12 sash, the blind arch, and the terracotta cornerstones and keystones at the first floor level.

She said at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level it becomes somewhat simpler with the terracotta sill and keystone and flat voussoirs. She said at the third floor level were simple

openings but with the variation in brick treatment. The formal façade was somewhat altered by the addition of the canopy which does obscure some of the architectural detail. She showed the original brick steps leading into the curved cheeks with the original handrails and the fanlight of door. She talked about the urban context and social clubs of Seattle. This area was originally residential district that complemented what is now known as Pioneer Square was gradually absorbed by commercial development particularly after 1902. By 1930 the original late 19<sup>th</sup> century residential district had been absorbed by commercial and real estate development. While the original residential district was primarily composed of single family residences is also included numerous churches, meeting and fraternal buildings. Land use pattern continued as major new churches, clubs and fraternal organizations continued to be constructed in the downtown commercial district. Social clubs and fraternal organizations were an essential aspect of burgeoning communities in the West; and offered social networks. Examples of social clubs: the Rainer Club, established in 1888 with its clubhouse constructed in 1902, is the quintessential men's' social club; the Eagles Temple (1925), the Elks Club Building, built in 1912 but demolished several years ago; the College Club which was constructed in tandem with subject building and demolished in 1962; the YMCA built in 1907, Arctic Building 1913-17. She said there were neighborhood based community clubhouses such as the Queen Anne Club Buildings, Mt. Baker Park and Camp Long.

There were many women's clubs and they functioned as opportunities to pursuer educational, philanthropic, cultural, social activities outside of church and family. In 1925 the Seattle Chamber published a directory that listed over 700 clubs based in the city and that did not include fraternal and religious organizations. There were numerous alumni organizations representing major colleges. But the only education-based social clubs that operated their own downtown clubhouses were the male only College Club and the Women's University Club. There are few women club buildings but there are important ones like the Women's Century Club which was established in 1891 with the building constructed in 1926 now known as the Harvard Exit Theater; and the Sunset Club on First Hill which was established around the same time as the WUC and is located in a Georgian Revival designed building constructed in 1915.

She said downtown two buildings which were associated with women's organizations were the WUC and the YWCA. I-5 was aligned to avoid the old courthouse and ran along east side requiring the demolition of the College Club but saving the WUC.

She said the WUC meets at least two or three criteria. She said it is associated with significant cultural, political and economic heritage of the city; it embodies distinctive style of Georgian Revival; and it is an outstanding work of a designer or architect, A. H. Albertson and E. F. Champney.

She introduced Susan Boyle who would speak about the 1962 addition and the interior of the original building.

Ms. Sodt asked the Board if there were questions for Ms. Krafft.

Mr. Abelsen said the building was described as Georgian Revival and that he was curious about the spring block and the keystone and how sharply they contrast to the brick and if that was consistent. Ms. Kraft said it ties more to original design of the original clubhouse.

Suzanne Price, President of the Women's University Club provided a brief background of the history and the activities of the club. The club was formed in 1914 by a small group of college-educated women who wished to enlarge the cultural, educational and social activities for themselves and their contemporaries. She said there was talk of installing an adjoining door to the College Club but that didn't transpire. She said women purchased the land at 6<sup>th</sup> and Spring and sold bonds to construct the building. Originally single women lived on residential floors but since the late 1960s and early 1970s there are no longer residential rooms. Eleanor Roosevelt spent a night there in 1938( by coincidence on March 28 her last secretary will come speak to the club). In 1962 the spaces were enlarged to accommodate trainings; offices were added; dining areas expanded and a kitchen was added to serve a membership of 1000. Over the years the club has and seeks racial diversity in its membership and over the years the building has been witness to many well-known, outstanding speakers and has been the site for hundreds of educational and cultural events. She said the members continue to be devoted to the stewardship of this lovely building. She shared the comments of a longtime club member, "our club is a place not only of friendship and enjoyment but of learning. It is a priceless jewel we cannot replace it nor find what it offers any place else".

Sonja Sokol-Furesz of BOLA Architecture + Planning said the 1962 addition was designed by Robert L. Durham. She said it has simple lines, simple materials; it is a concrete frame addition with dark red brick veneer, some concrete coping and those elements lightly frame wall of windows. The main floor was designed to incorporate a large dining room and commercial kitchen; at and below grade there were 23 stalls for parking.

Ms. Boyle said the narrow space between the club and the hotel is public park space.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the addition was significantly lower than, and setback from, the 1922 building so it is clearly secondary. There have been a number of exterior alterations made over time. She said the most prominent is the installed black metal screen and parking gate, and the balustrade above originally finished in white has been painted black. She said the windows have been altered; they were divided and have been replaced with glass, bronze anodized aluminum frame windows. She said one can also see the duct work at the south end of the 1962 façade. The dining room in the 1962 addition was originally finished in modern style and has been redone to provide a more traditional appearance.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz said the entry of the 1922 building was altered to provide for the changing needs of the club. In the 1960s, many alterations were made to 1922 structure to modernize and be in keeping with the 1962 addition. In the 1980s and 1990s there were alterations to bring it back to original appearance.

Ms. Boyle said that Architect Robert L. Durham's other buildings: Fauntleroy Congregational Church which is landmarked; the SW Branch Seattle Public Library, St. James Presbyterian Church in Bellingham; and Fire Station # 5. She said Durham

had a stretchability in terms of his prowess and building types. She said he also designed the Horizon House, AGC Building. The Evergreen State College is a Durham Anderson Fried Building.

She said Durham was ambitious. His brother was a doctor and they built themselves a small wooden trailer they lived in which provided inexpensive housing for them. He was prolific in his interests: lectures, travels, and writing. In 1941 Stewart and Durham formed a partnership that lasted nearly a decade. Durham had a brief sole proprietorship in the 1930s and buildings that date from that period varied from industrial buildings to churches, and residential. Stewart and Durham were cited for their work. All Saints Episcopal Church in Burien was cited in many architectural publications in the 1950s and 1960s as being special. Over half their projects were churches. Durham formed Durham Anderson Fried and for the balance of his career he worked in that partnership, which had a prolific practice. She said that, in the context of his work, the 1962 addition to the WUC was very minor. She said she looked in the archives of the WUC which contained very little information about this addition. Durham was cited by AIA and Durham Anderson Freed won many competitions and awards for their designs. The 1962 WUC addition does not have the character of the original building nor is it an important work of Robert L. Durham.

Judy Donnelly, Executive Manager of the WUC provided a history of the WUC and said that as membership grew they utilized the space in different ways. They have been good stewards of the clubhouse and their membership wants to stay in the building. They are a non-profit organization operated on a break-even budget. They have created a building assessment that is billed on a monthly basis to the members in order to meet the needs and the challenges with an older building. The 1922 building meets several criteria. The 1962 addition is not outstanding; it is functional but has no historical value or significance to the clubhouse. They would like to be able to make changes to the 1962 portion as needed. This is a private club and is not accessible to the public. Alterations have been made to meet the changing needs of membership. Interior portion of the 1922 no historical value. They ask that the interior not be designated to allow them flexibility to make changes. They would like the same consideration as was given to the Washington Athletic Club and ask that just the exterior of the 1922 building be designated.

#### Board Questions:

Mr. Veith said he was a guest at the club several years ago; there were three large public rooms on the main floor which looked old.

Ms. Donnelly said that when the 1962 building was added they tried to make the first floor look like one cohesive design. They installed drop ceilings, lowering the ceilings in the drawing room, the library and the original dining room. As they started to appreciate the old style building, the acoustical ceilings were removed and the original detailing that had been removed was replicated and additional trim details were added. When the 1962 addition was constructed they reconfigured the north hallway portion to add restrooms and an elevator.

Ms. Sodt said the interiors have been altered significantly.

Ms. Sokol-Furesz provided a list of alterations that were made to the building.

Mr. Abelsen asked what goes on in the club.

Ms. Price said men are welcome, all husbands and widowers are considered members and can use facilities, they just can't vote. They offer all kinds of classes: Italian, Spanish, French, Philosophy, Literature, Book Review, Creative Writing, Oil Painting, Water Color, Cuisine.

Mr. Abelsen said the report indicated the building use was intended to be a literary artistic center; he said when he thinks of literary and artistic centers it is a place where artist and writers could meet, convene, expand upon and make an impact on the City and community.

Ms. Donnelly said it was for the self enrichment of the members.

Ms. Krafft said the early emphasis was on literary and drama; the club has evolved over time and is much broader but still with the academic focus on learning and world affairs.

Ms. Krafft said the other clubs did not have the desire or the tenaciousness to build their own building and to maintain it and to continue to use it. She said that while looking at the building and she was ignoring the addition. She said she realized that while the addition is not one of the better examples of the Architects' work, it is a very well designed addition. It is very respectful of the original design, modern in its own era but secondary and setback.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Lee asked the Board if they had enough information to vote.

Ms. Sodt suggested that she quickly review the staff recommendation for the Board. She said that staff recommends that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the 1920 building excluding the 1962 addition. Although the design of the 1962 addition is sympathetic to the original building the addition has been altered and when compared to the body of work by Durham it doesn't appear to be an outstanding example. She said she doesn't recommend nomination of any interior spaces as there really are no significant interior public spaces that remain intact.

The consensus was that the Board was in agreement with the staff report.

**Action:**

I move approval of the Women's University Club at 1105 Sixth Avenue for consideration as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description in the Nomination Form; that the features and characteristics proposed for preservation include the exterior of the 1922 building, excluding the 1962 addition; that the public meeting for Board consideration of designation is scheduled for April 2, 2008; that this action conforms to the known comprehensive and development plans of the City of Seattle.



**MM/SC/MH/VA**

**9:0:0**

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Chave, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator